

# ***Interactive comment on “Comment on “Estimating the depth and evolution of intrusions at resurgent calderas: Los Humeros (Mexico)” by Urbani et al. (2020)” by Gianluca Norini and Gianluca Groppelli***

**Joachim Gottsmann (Editor)**

j.gottsmann@bristol.ac.uk

Received and published: 28 August 2020

Dear Authors,

I have received two reviews for your paper and have provided my own views in the attached document.

The two reviewers recommend publication of the comment as is. The reviews are extremely short, superficial and offer no real guidance/supporting information for an editor to make an executive decision. This is why I have chosen to provide an additional review on my own. My assessment of your submission is drastically different from the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



views of both reviewers.

To my mind your paper uses unnecessarily abrasive and condescending language including words like "obviously known" "easily accessible" which have no room in a scientific discourse. I am disappointed in having to read comments on a published paper that are largely judgmental and lack concrete underpinning arguments.

1) You refer to available data throughout the text but fail to disclose where that data is in fact accessible.

2) You mix the terms "data" and "interpretations". This may just be poor wording but you need to be much clearer in your statements. Data are, for example, measurements and are different from interpretations published in the literature

3) Your statements such as "easily accessible", "well-known", etc ( I have highlighted many of these instances in the attached pdf) are out of place and have no room in a factual scientific discourse. You may have a point in many or all of the arguments you provide which contrast with the interpretations expressed by Urbani et al, but your writing lets you down significantly. I would expect to be presented with factual evidence rather than judgmental and ill-conceived statements on where Urbani et al are "wrong". There is no such thing as "correct" or "wrong" when one interprets field data from processes that no one has witnessed.

4) There is no room in a scientific comment for uncertainty and vague expressions. If you have a problem with statements in another paper then you must provide factual evidence to counter their argument rather than providing judgments.

I have additionally done some research on the GEMex project and reports arising from the project. I note that you co-authored several reports with parts of the Urbani et al author team and those reports are publicly accessible. Several reports you co-authored include findings that have been included in Urbani et al.

To my mind Solid Earth is being (mis-)used as a platform for infighting amongst (for-

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

mer?) members a research team which I will not condone. The interactive forum which is open to receive comments from the community on papers at the discussion stage would have been the platform to voice your concerns.

That said, I'd be inclined to consider a heavily tuned-down comment that it is based on well-supported arguments against the views expressed by Urbani et al including a scientific discourse worthy of publication without any reference to a judgmental or condescending narrative.

J. Gottsmann Executive Editor Solid Earth

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://se.copernicus.org/preprints/se-2020-110/se-2020-110-EC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2020-110>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

